

served that in the estimates there was an appropriation for Victoria of \$150,000 for harbour improvements. I received a reply from the minister in which he clearly showed that he had no misrepresentation as to what particular city I was referring to because he wrote as follows:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 16th inst. having reference to the need of a new dredging plant in the harbour of Victoria, British Columbia, and will give your representations careful consideration.

On receipt of that letter all my doubts were set at rest. In the city of Victoria, British Columbia we have an association composed of the most prominent merchants of all shades of political opinion who are interested in the development of the harbour, called the Inner Harbour Association, and I informed the secretary of that association that there was an appropriation of \$150,000 for Victoria Harbour. I have since, of course, explained how the error arose. Now, I wish to say a few words with regard to the justice of an appropriation for the harbour of Victoria, British Columbia. In the first place I may say that the secretary of this harbour association is a gentleman who up to the present time has worked for the improvement of that harbour practically without any remuneration whatever. Some years ago, he, at the request of the Department of Public Works furnished that department with a complete set of his plans as to the full development of that harbour, but unfortunately those plans were destroyed in the fire which burned the western block. However from time to time appropriations were made, very small appropriations it is true, in connection with the dredging work in the city of Victoria, but last year—I would not like to insinuate that the proximity of the election had anything to do with it—the city of Victoria was voted an appropriation of \$60,000 for the dredging of its harbour. That was the first time in the history of that port, I think I am safe in saying, that it had received more than \$10,000. That appropriation has not all been spent, \$30,000 out of the \$60,000 still remains unspent. The people of Victoria were allowed to suppose, I do not say it was distinctly stated but at any rate the people of Victoria had come to the conclusion that the scheme of development that had been outlined by the gentleman I mentioned and to whom the city of Victoria is so greatly indebted owing to his efforts on her behalf, had been adopted, and that the government were commencing on a scheme whereby they would, by the appropriation of a certain amount each year, in time complete the work in connection with that harbour. However, I find that this year there is no special appropriation for the city of Victoria.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is quite in error as to that.

Mr. BARNARD. I would like the hon. gentleman to correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will find in the dredging vote an item for dredging for British Columbia, out of which the work will be carried on.

Mr. BARNARD. I said that there was no special vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And there being no special vote we can use the general vote.

Mr. BARNARD. There is a general vote for British Columbia. There is also a deputation from Vancouver asking for a very considerable appropriation in connection with dredging of the Narrows at the entrance to that harbour. Then a large amount of money is required for dredging in the Fraser river. A government dredge is coming from Germany and the impression is that the appropriation of \$125,000 will not be sufficient to keep the government dredges in operation during the year, because in that province we are so favoured by climatic conditions that work can be continued for twelve months. In addition to that there is a large amount of work to be done in the Arrow lakes, at least the government have a dredge there, and I assume that they would not have it there unless it was necessary. The Minister of Public Works says there is an appropriation of \$125,000 for general dredging in British Columbia. I am very glad to see that, but as compared with other provinces, particularly with the minister's province of New Brunswick, that the appropriation is insignificant. I notice that the minister's appropriation for dredging in St. John is \$475,000, that is a special vote for St. John.

An hon. MEMBER. And that is not enough.

Mr. BARNARD. Possibly it is not enough, but if we are in times of financial stringency, as the Minister of Public Works tells us, then it is only fair that everybody should get a fair share, and the minister himself has stated to me this afternoon that he considers Victoria a most important port.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARNARD. I wish to quote a few figures to show the importance of Victoria in comparison, not with St. John alone, but with the other great ports of Canada. In the summary of the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, in the statement showing the number of tonnage of sea-going vessels, both steam and sail, entered and cleared from the following principal ports during the year, 1906-7 and 1908, it is stated that the sea-going tonnage of the various ports for 1908 was as follows: